



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/543,082	03/03/2006	Andreas Reinhard	27793-00099USPX	1172
61060	7590	12/14/2007	EXAMINER	
WINSTEAD PC			HOOK, JAMES F	
P.O. BOX 50784			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 75201			3754	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/14/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/543,082	REINHARD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> James F. Hook	<b>Art Unit</b> 3754	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James F. Hook. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. Shoaib Mithani (applicant's rep.). (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 06 December 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Fuhrmann, Rains, and Nichols.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



JAMES HOOK  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed the prior art rejection under Fuhrmann and that the examiner feels the figure 2 embodiment would inherently meet the buckling prevention requirement in that the ribbed structure meeting the same claimed physical features would inherently function the same to some extent which would meet the claim language. The same is true of figures 10 and 13 of Rains which also show the same structure as is claimed in claim 1 and would inherently meet the intended use of providing buckling prevention. With respect to Nichols it was argued that the embodiment of figure 3 would not prevent buckling in the section 25 of the apparatus but this is not considered persuasive when section 25 extends outward from the point where the two projections meet at a 90 degree angle and that the extension of this section would provide at least some flow near the 90 degree joint area which would meet the claim language, and further that figure 4 shows an embodiment without section 25 being needed, therefore it was considered that the proposed claim language further modifying the buckling prevention use and function would not read over the prior art of record without extensive measures being taken to prove the prior art would not function in the same manner as the applicants claimed invention. It was recommended by the examiner that structural differences between the prior art and applicant's invention be put in the claims to overcome the references.